

Encyclopedia of Criminological Theory

Quinney, Richard: Social Transformation and Peacemaking Criminology

Contributors: John F. Wozniak

Editors: Francis T. Cullen & Pamela Wilcox

Book Title: Encyclopedia of Criminological Theory

Chapter Title: "Quinney, Richard: Social Transformation and Peacemaking Criminology"

Pub. Date: 2010

Access Date: September 12, 2014

Publishing Company: SAGE Publications, Inc.

City: Thousand Oaks

Print ISBN: 9781412959186

Online ISBN: 9781412959193

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412959193.n208>

Print pages: 754-764

©2010 SAGE Publications, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

This PDF has been generated from SAGE knowledge. Please note that the pagination of the online version will vary from the pagination of the print book.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412959193.n208>

Richard Quinney is a sociologist who gained international renown as a radical criminologist. In various writings, he drew attention to the relationship between capitalism and crime and also analyzed crime and its control from a number of perspectives. Quinney's notoriety and progression as a criminologist can be discerned through an examination of five standpoints including his (1) characterization by scholarly peers, (2) biography and career stages, (3) movement of writings from perspective to perspective to perspective, (4) focus on social transformation and peacemaking criminology, and (5) legacy of work for the field of criminology. A key theme of this entry is that, during the major stages of his intellectual career, Quinney laid the foundation for his articulation of a peacemaking criminology. Thus, this perspective represents a growth in his way of thinking rather than a rejection of his earlier criminologies.

Characterization by Scholarly Peers

Quinney is known as one of the 15 pioneers in criminology (Martin et al., 1990). Quinney's criminological writings began in the 1960s and spanned each decade into the 1990s. He retired as a professor emeritus in 1998. His work continues to be [p. 754 ↓] discussed in prominent introductory sociology and criminology textbooks as an example of how a conflict theory approach can be applied to the study of crime. Recent crime theory textbooks also have attributed the origins and development of Marxist criminology and peacemaking criminology to his writings. Further illustrative of his impact, Quinney ranked in 2000 among the top 10 most-cited scholars in criminology (Wright, 2000, p. 119). In 1984, he received the Edwin H. Sutherland Award from the American Society of Criminology. This annual award recognized his outstanding contributions to criminological theory. Also, from the American Society of Criminology, he was presented the Major Achievement Award by the Critical Criminology Division in 1998. In 1986, he earned the Fulbright Lecture and Research Award from the Department of Political Science and Sociology at University College in Galway, Ireland. In 1992, he obtained the President's Award from the Western Society of Criminology. In 2009, he attained the Sullivan Tiffit Vanguard Award from the Justice Studies Association for his "outstanding service to the academic discipline of criminology for the past 40 years."

The next part of this entry discusses Quinney's biography and career stages. After that, his movement from perspective to perspective to perspective is delineated in relation to his career stages.

Biography and Career Stages

Several writings have provided reflections and accounts about the life of Quinney (Wozniak, in press). When such writings are examined as a whole, basic tendencies become apparent in the biography and career stages of this prominent criminologist. First, these accounts of his life emphasized the importance of his growing up during the Great Depression on his family farm in Walworth County, which is 5 miles from Delavan, Wisconsin (near the state capital, Madison). Second, his childhood experiences were typical for the times such that he performed farm chores and helped in the breeding of pigs; played trombone in the high school band; and wrote and took pictures for the school newspaper. Third, during Quinney's grade school and high school years, a quality of his personal character began that persisted for the rest of his life. This quality is that he tended to emerge among his peers as a leader. For example, during the eighth grade, he agreed to give the commencement speech; during high school, he formed a musical band to play at school dances; and he was elected as the president of the student body at Carroll College.

As an undergraduate student at Carroll College, Quinney again took some typical paths. For instance, he joined a fraternity and worked during the summer months as a hospital orderly. This latter job was pursued to gain firsthand work experience in keeping with his plan to become a hospital administrator. In fact, he majored both in biology and sociology to blend his educational interests toward a future hospital administration career path. However, during another summer employment as a hospital bill collector in Chicago, he disliked calling patients to pay their bills. As a result, upon graduating with a bachelor of science degree from Carroll College in 1956, Quinney decided to pursue graduate sociology studies at Northwestern University. He was greatly encouraged by the sociology department chair, Kimball Young, to study sociology at an advanced level. There, he assisted in the teaching of a criminology course, which was his initial exposure to the sociological study of crime (Trevino, 1984). Again, emerging as a leader among his peers, Quinney received his master's degree in sociology in 9 months. This

took place upon his completion of his master's thesis, which was a study of the growth of a city and the complexity of its human relations titled *Urbanization and the Scale of Society*.

After completing his master's degree, Quinney embarked on doctoral studies in sociology. In 1957, he was awarded a research assistantship in the rural sociology program at the University of Wisconsin–Madison. Providing insight into directions his academic career would take over the next three decades, Quinney commented in his *Autobiographical Reflections* about his times as a sociology doctoral student. He wrote about himself in the third person and referred to himself as “Earl,” which is his first name; he changed his name to “Richard” in the 1960s:

In those graduate school days, students were encouraged to dabble in fields of study outside sociology. Earl took courses in the philosophy of science, physical and cultural anthropology, American history, social and intellectual history, and archaeology, as well as the full range of courses [p. 755 ↓] in sociology. He spent days of complete abandonment in a carrel in the university library and in the State Historical Society library. Gradually he began to focus on the relation of social institutions, especially religious and legal institutions, to the larger social and economic order. At a time in the 1950s when most graduate students were not exposed to Marxist ideas, it began to occur to him that the world was dominated by those with money and power. (p. 47)

As a sociology doctoral student, Quinney shifted his main interests from rural sociology to social theory and chose to complete one of his comprehensive exams on criminology. Notably, he was planning to conduct his dissertation research on religion with Howard Becker as his supervisor, who died unexpectedly at the beginning of this dissertation project (Martin et al., 1990).

In 1960, Quinney took a temporary Instructor of Sociology position at St. Lawrence University in Canton, New York. There, he began again to undertake a dissertation project about crime and asked Marshall Clinard to serve as his supervisor. Under Clinard's direction, he completed his dissertation, *Retail Pharmacy as a Marginal Occupation: A Study of Prescription Violation*. He received a Ph.D. in sociology in 1962.

Quinney's dissertation was conventional and mainstream in nature. According to Martin et al., Quinney's dissertation "was based on a functionalist perspective" (p. 386).

After completing his doctorate, Quinney served as a sociology professor at nine other universities in the United States. First, he worked as an assistant professor at the University of Kentucky from 1962 to 1965. Second, he was employed as an associate professor at New York University from 1965 to 1970 and as a professor from 1970 to 1973. Third, in the years between those latter two appointments, he had a sabbatical and research and writing leaves from New York University from 1971 to 1974. He spent his sabbatical and these leaves at the Department of Sociology at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.

Fourth, he was a visiting professor at the City University of New York (Brooklyn College and the Graduate Center) from 1974 to 1975. Fifth, he was a visiting professor at Boston University during the fall of 1975. Sixth, he was a visiting professor at Brown University from 1975 to 1978 and an adjunct professor from 1978 to 1983. Seventh, he was a distinguished visiting professor at Boston College from 1978 to 1979 and an adjunct professor from 1980 to 1983. Eighth, he was a professor at the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee during spring 1980. Ninth, he was a professor of sociology at Northern Illinois University from 1983 until his retirement in 1998.

Movement of Writings from Perspective to Perspective to Perspective

As noted, Quinney's doctoral dissertation involved a mainstream sociological analysis of prescription violation in the retail pharmacy occupation. He published various journal articles from his dissertation research. His working relationship with his dissertation supervisor, Marshall Clinard, also embellished his early academic career. They coauthored a well-received book that formulated an expansive typology of criminal behavior systems.

So, what happened in Quinney's academic life and research work that led him to be known as a key American spokesperson for radical criminology and as a sharp critic of

the relationship of capitalism to crime? Before addressing this question in terms of his specific career stages, some related observations can be made.

First, as mentioned earlier, Quinney, during his youth, displayed an ability to be a leader among peers. Thus, he adopted more of a stance of an innovator in criminology rather than a follower in this field. Second, Quinney's upbringing tended to influence his analysis of how crime comes to be experienced by people in contemporary society and his notions of populism (i.e., a focus upon the interests of the common people). Third, according to Anderson (2008), Quinney's journey in criminology was "to, through, and beyond Marxism" and involved work that entailed a sense of empathy with individual suffering and the oppressed (p. 3).

Fourth, as discussed earlier, Quinney was encouraged as a sociology doctoral student to "dabble in fields outside sociology." Not only did he take courses at the University of Wisconsin at Madison in anthropology, in archaeology, in American, social, and intellectual history, and in the philosophy of science, but he also widely read in other disciplines throughout his academic career in the 1960s to 1990s. He was trained as a [p. 756 ↓] sociologist who focused upon criminology, but his writings commonly extended beyond the borders of the disciplines of sociology and criminology.

In contrast, there have been thoughts among criminologists that Quinney's continued shift from perspective to perspective to perspective in criminology was generally a jumbled, incoherent collection of writings that were somewhat out-of-step with the ongoing theories and research of mainstream criminology. In fact, after Quinney delivered his acceptance speech for his 1984 Edwin H. Sutherland Award, a discussion arose among those in the audience about whether "Quinney was saying goodbye to criminology" because he had a new focus on a prophetic, religious orientation in his analysis of society (Martin et al., 1990, p. 398).

However, a different interpretation of Quinney's career work in criminology can be offered. When his career stages were examined with his criminology writings as a whole, there was much more of a pattern, rather than a discontinuity, in his intellectual enterprise. Importantly, as discussed below, his intellectual stages were highly cohesive, deeply humane in orientation, and socially progressive in many respects.

Thus, the remainder of this section first lays out when and where Quinney produced his varying perspectives in criminology. Second, the discussion also indicates how his experiences with social activism and socially progressive groups played an important role in his development of crime analysis from perspective to perspective to perspective. Third, this section identifies each of the theoretical perspectives that he applied to crime and his core writings linked to each of these perspectives. Fourth, this section shows that each perspective and set of writings were consistent with Quinney's call for the development of peacemaking criminology.

Furthermore, it is instructive to note that Quinney authored *Bearing Witness to Crime and Social Justice* in which he commented upon and provided illustrations of his writings from the 1960s through the 1990s. In the preface of this book, he made three sets of observations, which presented an inter-connected rationale about why he moved from perspective to perspective to perspective in his writings in keeping with ever-changing developments of the United States in the latter 1990s.

First, Quinney wrote the following about his initial years as a sociology professor:

When I began graduate school in 1956, the dominant stance in the social sciences—in sociology in particular—was the acceptance of existing social conditions. Perhaps because of my background, on the edge of two worlds, town and country, I became an observer and critic of the status quo.... Enough to say here that as I studied sociology I became greatly interested in the social problems endemic to the country. Asking, of course, Why? And how could things be different? (p. x)

Second, in regard to the political unrest of the 1960s and 1970s and how it was linked to the development of Marxist and radical criminology, Quinney stated,

Clearly, what was defined as crime was a product of the economic and political life of the country. Criminal laws were constructed to protect special interests and to maintain a specific social and moral order. This understanding of law and order was evident in the turmoils of the time: the civil rights movement for radical equality, the protests against the

war in Vietnam, and the revolts within the universities. At the same time, there was emerging a legal apparatus, called the criminal justice system, to control threatening behavior and to preserve the established order. Critical criminology developed with an awareness of these events and conditions. By many names—radical, Marxist, progressive—a critical criminology was created to understand and to change the direction of the country. (p. x)

Third, Quinney stipulated that his writings from perspective to perspective to perspective were commonly linked as follows:

My own travels through the 1960s, the 1970s, the 1980s, and the 1990s were marked by a progression of ways of thinking and acting: from the social constructionist perspective to phenomenology, from phenomenology to Marxist and critical philosophy, from Marxist and critical philosophy to liberation theology, from liberation theology to Buddhism and existentialism. And then to a more ethnographic and personal mode of thinking and being. It is necessary to note that in all of these travels nothing was rejected or deleted from the previous stages; rather, each new stage of development incorporated what had preceded it. Each [p. 757 ↓] change was motivated by the need to understand crime in another or more complex way, in a way excluded from a former understanding. Each stage incorporated the changes that were taking place in my personal life. There was to be no separation between life and theory, between witnessing and writing. (pp. x–xi)

In this light, Quinney's criminological writings over the course of his career can be visualized (as he also tended to view it) as “artifacts of one social theorist who is trying to make sense of the world, who is bearing witness to the sufferings in the world, and who is hoping at the same time for a better world” (p. x).

Another lens to distinguish the genesis of Quinney's writings is to view his academic career as falling into five periods: 1960–1965. Canton, New York, and Lexington, Kentucky—first teaching jobs. Civil rights movement begins. *Criminal Behavior Systems*, empirical research, first articles. 1965–1971. New York City. Antiwar protests.

Counter-culture, *The Problem of Crime*, *The Social Reality of Crime*, radical sociology, photography.

1971–1974. Chapel Hill, North Carolina. Sabbatical leaves from NYU. Resigns from full professor position. Socialist community, *Critique of Legal Order*. Beginning of *Class, State, and Crime*.

1974–1983. Providence, Rhode Island. Part-time teaching positions. Marxism, theology, spiritual search, revision of *The Problem of Crime*, writing of *Providence*, Buddhism.

1983–2000. Return to the Midwest. DeKalb, Illinois. Ethnography of everyday life, keeping of journals, photography, teaching environmental sociology, teaching peace and social justice, personal essays, *Criminology as Peacemaking*, *For the Time Being*, *Borderland*.

During each of these periods, Quinney's academic work was coupled with an active and direct involvement in various political (civil rights movement, antiwar protests, socialist community meetings) and interpersonal growth (spiritual search, study of Buddhism, ethnographic writings, photography) interests and activities. Relatedly, at the height of development of Marxist and radical theories and research of the Department of Criminology at the University of California, Berkeley, he traveled there to become acquainted firsthand with socially progressive ideas emerging about crime, evolving from criminology professors and students at the Berkeley campus and community.

Again, in Quinney's way of thinking, each of his criminological writings was done to "make sense of the world" in hope "for a better world." For example, in his coauthored book *Criminal Behavior Systems*, he played a key role in applying a functionalist analysis of crime that was unprecedented in its comprehensiveness and scope. That is, no other criminology book or research during that period of time examined nine types of criminal behavior (violent personal, occasional property, public order, conventional, political, occupational, corporate, organized, professional) in terms of five categories (legal aspects, criminal career, group support, legitimate behavior, societal reaction, and legal processing). It was also during his New York City stage of the 1960s that he spent

long periods of time examining crime statistics on 23rd Street at the National Council on Crime and Delinquency Library.

Hence, during his employment as a sociology professor in New York City, Quinney authored two books, both published in 1970. One was titled *The Problem of Crime*, which was essentially a textbook of five chapters covering the meaning of crime (e.g., nature, types, and sources of criminal law); the development of criminology (e.g., before the 1800s, the 1800s, the 1900s), contemporary study of crime (e.g., criminal statistics, causal and philosophical assumptions in crime data); crime in American society (e.g., urban crimes, public morality crimes, business crimes, political crimes); and the future of crime. Similar to his earlier book, *The Problem of Crime* provided a broad treatment of salient themes addressed in each chapter. In this work, he pinpointed the need to pay closer attention to the “politicality of crime” given that much of the behavior that society labels as criminal had a political character.

In *The Social Reality of Crime*, Quinney's intent was to shift attention away from searching for the causes of crime and toward a reorientation of the study of crime about how the justice system affects criminal behavior. Here, according to Martin [p. 758 ↓] et al., he was concerned with how definitions of criminals were constructed and how they were applied. Adapting emphases of conflict theory and phenomenology in his analysis, he posited in the *Social Reality of Crime* that the relationship between crime and the social order could be understood in terms of six propositions:

- 1. Crime is a definition of human conduct created by authorized agents in a politically organized society.
- 2. Criminal definitions describe behaviors that conflict with the interests of segments of society that have power to shape public policy.
- 3. Criminal definitions are applied by segments of society that have power to shape the enforcement and administration of criminal law.
- 4. Behavior patterns are structured in segmentally organized society in relation to criminal definitions, and within this context persons engage in actions that have relative probabilities of being defined as criminal.
- 5. Conceptions of crime are constructed and diffused in the segments of society by various means of communication.

- 6. The social reality of crime is constructed by the formulation and application of criminal definitions, the development of behavior patterns related to criminal definitions, and the construction of criminal conceptions. (pp. 15–23)

Similar to *The Problem of Crime* and the *Social Reality of Crime*, both of Quinney's books, published while he was living in Chapel Hill, North Carolina, were conceived to address "how one becomes labeled a criminal" rather than to answer why an individual commits crime. That is, *Critique of Legal Order: Control in Capitalist Society and Class, State, and Crime* were designed to move beyond the basic tenets of conflict theory and phenomenology and toward a theoretical approach grounded more in Marxist theory.

In *Bearing Witness to Crime and Social Justice*, Quinney stated that he began *Critique of Legal Order* with "a call for a critical understanding of crime and the legal system. With a critical Marxian philosophy, I suggested, we could demystify the existing social order and, at the same time, create a world that moves us beyond the exploitation and oppression of capitalism" (p. xii).

To build his arguments in *Critique of Legal Order*, Quinney reviewed how positivist, social constructionist, and phenomenological modes of thinking were inadequate to accomplish an understanding of the American legal order. Instead, a critical Marxist approach provided better insight about "how the capitalist ruling class establishes its control over those it must oppress" (Quinney, p. 36). Moreover, Martin et al. maintained that this book illustrated that a class analysis could be applied to criminal law and crime control.

In essence, to revamp the social order, according to Quinney, it would require a transition from capitalism to socialism, which is further proposed in *Class, State, and Crime*. He used a structural Marxist approach to explain legal order in this latter book, which discussed crime and the development of capitalism. It is here that the often used depiction of Quinney's work appeared, which is that a capitalist economy produced crimes of domination and repression (committed by owners and the state to maintain the economic status quo); crimes of accommodation and adaptation (offenses committed by the workers and the poor to deal with class position deprivations); and crimes of resistance (committed by workers and the poor who have developed a class consciousness). According to Quinney, "only by going beyond capitalism to socialism,

could the contradictions that produce the crime problem be confronted. Crime will continue to be 'inevitable' as long as capitalist society exists" (1977, p. 126).

Additionally, *Class, State, and Crime* was concerned with "the prophetic meaning of social justice" which involved "the urge toward justice in human affairs. This urge becomes the will of divine origin operating in history, providing the source of inspiration to all prophets and revolutionaries" (p. 29). Quinney further maintained,

Our prophetic heritage perceives the driving force of history as being the struggle between justice and injustice. We the people—in a covenant with God—are responsible for the character of our lives and our society, for the pursuit of righteousness, justice, and mercy. The social and moral order is consequently rooted in the divine commandments; morality rests on divine command and concern rather than on the relativity of reasonableness. (pp. 29–30)

[p. 759 ↓]

This assertion in *Class, State, and Crime* of a need to apply themes of religion and spirituality into analyses of crime stemmed from Quinney's Marxist view that capitalist justice has an emphasis on human manipulation and control (i.e., workers are enslaved, that all things and human beings are transformed into objects, and that a demotion of our world into a mere environment; a demonic quality to our political state). Hence, Quinney expanded his application of notions of religion and spirituality into his discussion of *Providence: The Reconstruction of Social and Moral Order*. Quinney described his personal impetus for *Providence*: "More than ever before, I began to combine the spiritual and the material.... After twenty-five years of excluding religious questions from my life, I was returning to questions that were essentially religious" (2001, p. 38).

Providence turned attention toward the religious response to capitalism and included a chapter on "a religious socialist order." In keeping with his previous analysis, in *Providence* he pointed out that a prophetic imagination "reflects the presence of the divine in history. Things of the world have their meaning not so in themselves as in the spiritual, in the word of God revealed in the world" (p. 113). Quinney ended *Providence*

with these imageries: “Our historical struggle is thus for the creation of a social and moral order that prepares us for the ultimate of divine grace—the Kingdom of God fulfilled. Peace and justice through the Kingdom of God” (p. 114).

Social Transformation and Peacemaking Criminology

So far, this entry has examined Quinney as a criminologist through three standpoints. These are his characterization by scholarly peers, his biography and career stages, and his movement from perspective to perspective to perspective. This analysis revealed his tendencies to act as a leader among his peers; promote ideas reflecting his experiences with populism ideals; and link his sociological interests with concerns in other related fields of study. However, only some key books of Quinney were addressed in this entry. Space limitations do not permit further analysis of over 30 books and nearly 80 journal articles that he produced during his lifetime. Nonetheless, Quinney's work has an ongoing concern to promote the development of social transformation in our contemporary society. This concern for social transformation closely coincided with his call and support for a peacemaking approach to emerge in criminology.

A first example of Quinney's concern with social transformation is in *Critique of Legal Order*. In the first chapter of this book, he posited that there are types of philosophical approaches that could be used to understand the legal order: positivistic, social constructionist, phenomenological, and critical. He suggested that in his work, he passed through each of the first three phases and was in the fourth (i.e., critical) approach (Martin et al., 1990, p. 394). Upon demonstrating shortcomings of the first three approaches, he endorsed adopting a critical philosophy of the legal order so that a critical-Marxian analysis of crime control in capitalist society could be developed. According to Quinney,

In critically understanding (and demystifying) our current historical reality, we are in a position to act in a way that will remove our oppression and create a new existence. Though we are subject to the objective conditions of our age, as human beings we are also

collectively involved in transforming our social reality. Our praxis is one of critical thought and action—reflecting upon the world and acting to transform it.... We can free ourselves from the oppression of the age only as we combine our thoughts and our actions, turning each back upon the other. (1974, p. 197)

A second example of Quinney's concern with social transformation is seen in *Class, State, and Crime*. He elaborated on the relationship between crime and capitalism and illustrated how the prophetic meaning of justice (as described earlier) affected the thinking of people in our society today. He spoke very positively about the latter:

Through the prophetic tradition, a tradition that is present also in the prophetic voice of Marxism ..., a meaning of justice that can transform the world and open the future is once again emerging. Marxism and theology are confronting each other in ways that allow us to understand our existence and consider our essential nature. (1977, p. 33)

[p. 760 ↓]

A third example of social transformation in Quinney's work is apparent in the third edition of his *Problem of Crime*, which included as its subtitle *A Peace and Social Justice Perspective*. In a chapter titled "Peace and Social Justice," Quinney and John Wildeman observed,

The peace and social justice perspective continues to develop in criminology. There are proposals and programs on mediation, conflict resolution, and reconciliation; there is the movement to abolish the death penalty; and there are humanist programs of rehabilitation and community organization. These are the practices of a criminology of peacemaking, a criminology that seeks to alleviate suffering and thereby reduce crime.... This is a criminology that is based necessarily on human transformation in the achievement of peace and justice. Human transformation takes place as we change our social, economic, and political structure. And the message is clear: Without peace within

us and in our actions, there can be no peace and justice in our results.
Peace is the way. (p. 110)

Moreover, Quinney and Wildeman recognized that changing the social structure needed to coincide with social transformation at the personal level. Thereby, they emphasized,

Without *inner* peace in each of us, without peace of mind and heart, there can be no *social* peace between people and no peace in societies, nations, and in the world. To be explicitly engaged in this process, of bringing about peace on all levels, of joining ends and means, is to be engaged in *peacemaking*. ... The radical nature of peacemaking is clear: No less is involved than the transformation of our human being. Indeed, we will be engaged in action, but action will come out of our transformed being. Rather than attempting to create a good society first and then trying to make ourselves better human beings, we have to work on the two simultaneously. The inner and the outer are the same.... The transformation of ourselves and the world becomes our constant practice, here and now. (1991, p. 117)

Further, on social transformation, Quinney and Wildeman concluded,

All of this is to say, to us as criminologists, that crime is suffering and that the ending of crime is possible only with the ending of suffering. And the ending both of suffering and of crime—the establishing of justice—can come only out of peace, out of a peace that is spiritually grounded in our very being.... To eliminate crime—to end the construction and perpetuation of an existence that makes crime possible—requires a transformation of our human being. We as human beings must *be* peace if we are to live in a world free of crime, in a world of peace. (pp. 118–119, emphasis in the original)

These latter three examples of Quinney's analyses of social transformation generally linked with his views of peacemaking criminology (Wozniak, 2008). Overall, there are six peacemaking criminology writings by Quinney as follows:

- 1. “The Theory and Practice of Peacemaking in the Development of Radical Criminology”
- 2. *The Problem of Crime: A Peace and Social Justice Perspective*, Third Edition
- 3. “The Way of Peace: On Crime, Suffering, and Service”
- 4. “A Life of Crime: Criminology and Public Policy as Peacemaking”
- 5. “Criminology as Moral Philosophy, Criminologist as Witness”
- 6. “Socialist Humanism and the Problem of Crime: Thinking About Erich Fromm in the Development of Critical/Peacemaking Criminology”

His second peacemaking criminology writing was addressed above in terms of its visions of social transformation. His first peacemaking criminology writing on the “The Theory and Practice of Peacemaking in the Development of Radical Criminology” specified that peacemaking is a “criminology that seeks to alleviate suffering and thereby reduce crime” (p. 5). He added that crime is one form of suffering all around us along with other forms such as poverty, hunger, violence, homelessness and destruction of the environment. Moreover, our criminal justice system is founded on violence, according to Quinney, and is a system that assumes violence can be overcome by violence. In this social context, he suggested the need [p. 761 ↓] for both social transformation (i.e., changing our social, economic, and political structure) and personal transformation (i.e., care given to the inner life of us). In Quinney's view, no peace can result without peace within us and in our actions.

In his “Way of Peace” chapter, Quinney identified a list of assumptions supporting a rationale for the development of peacemaking criminology. He again contended that inner and social peace must come together at the same time and social transformation pertained to “the transformation of our human being. Political and economic solutions without this transformation inevitably fail” (p. 4).

Quinney's fourth peacemaking criminology writing “A Life of Crime: Criminology and Public Policy as Peacemaking” challenged criminologists to re-examine their personal and professional agenda. Thereby, he suggested that criminologists would do well to support peacemaking criminology as a “compassionate criminology” that “recognizes the interrelatedness of everything; that everyone is connected to each other and to their environment”—while also recognizing that crime rates still remain high and that

our justice system has limited success in its correctional settings (p. 3). In this article, he encouraged personal transformation. On social transformation, Quinney similarly recommended that the “objective is quite simple: to be kind to one another, to break down barriers that separate us from one another, to live moment-to-moment our connection to all that is ... our oneness” (p. 6).

Quinney dealt with social transformation in one other peacemaking article, “Socialist Humanism and the Problem of Crime: Thinking About Erich Fromm in the Development of Critical/Peacemaking Criminology.” Quinney noted that Fromm, as a lifelong activist for peace, posited that the establishment of peace is a central task of humanity. In regard to social transformation, Quinney stated, like he had done in his “A Life of Crime” article, in peacemaking criminology, “the objective is clear: be kind to one another, to transcend the barriers that separate us from one another and to live everyday life with a sense of independence” (p. 26). He concluded: “Positive peace exists when the sources of crime—poverty, inequality, racism, and alienation—are not present” (p. 28). Hence, punishment (negative peace) is not the way of peace; positive peace (i.e., striving to eliminate the structure of violence and crime) is the objective of peacemaking criminology.

Legacy of Work for the Field of Criminology

This entry has demonstrated that the paths that Quinney had taken in becoming a peacemaking criminologist involved more patterns than discontinuities. Quinney's upbringing as a young boy living with his family on a small Wisconsin farm induced him to have a focus on the interests of common people throughout his career as a sociology professor and criminologist. Although he was best known for applying conflict theory into the field of criminology, Quinney took many controversial stands in his criminological writings as a way to “make better sense of the world” in hope “for a better world.” Through his involvement in criminological perspectives ranging from functionalism to Marxist theory and critical philosophy to peacemaking criminology, he commonly brought socially progressive ideas into criminological discourse.

Quinney produced his varied writings addressing perspective to perspective to perspective of criminology upon ongoing connection with people actively and directly

involved in political and community movements and interpersonal growth interests and activities. Hence, his call for the development of a combined personal and social transformation was far from being an academic lip service. Indeed, he put his urging to develop this combined type of transformation into actual practice in his daily life.

Quinney's travels from his life on a Wisconsin farm to becoming a peacemaking criminologist enabled his academic writings to contribute a host of themes to be part of the teaching and research literature of criminology in the latter 1900s. His legacy for criminology was multiple and predicated upon compassion and sensitivity for those experiencing social harms and personal indignities. It seems reasonable to further suggest that no one in the field of criminology has addressed the study of crime in the constantly evolving, personally engaging, and socially uplifting ways that Quinney had done over the course of four decades.

In illustration of this point, the following is a list of concerns that Quinney's criminology writings brought into focus for past and current times:

- How justice systems affect criminal behavior.
- How definitions of criminals are constructed and applied.
- It is important to demystify the existing social order.
- There is a need to create a world that moves us beyond the exploitation and oppression of capitalism.
- Instead of attempting to resocialize the individual offender, we need to revamp the legal order.
- Concern should be directed toward the prophetic meaning of social justice.
- Views of crime need to combine the spiritual and material.
- It is useful to adopt a critical philosophy of the legal order.
- There is a need to reflect upon the world and act to transform it.
- Peacemaking is a criminology that seeks to alleviate suffering and thereby reduce crime.
- Social transformation involves inner peace and outer peace.
- Criminologists would do well to support peacemaking criminology as a "passionate criminology."
- The objective is quite simple—to be kind to one another, to break down barriers that separate us, and to link moment-to-moment our connection to all.

In sum, these and other compelling themes in Quinney's work have resulted from his travels to peacemaking criminology. Criminologists, with all in society, would do well to continue to address such themes now and in the future. In *The Problem of Crime*, Quinney and Wildeman state, "Without peace within us and in our actions, there can be no peace and justice in our results. Peace is the way" (p. 10).

John F. Wozniak

<http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412959193.n208>

See also

- [Abolitionism](#)
- [Anarchist Criminology](#)
- [Chambliss, William J.: Power, Conflict, and Crime](#)
- [Colvin, Mark: Coercion Theory](#)
- [Peacemaking Criminology](#)

References and Further Readings

Anderson, K. B. (2008). Richard Quinney's journey: The Marxist dimension . In J. F. Wozniak, ed. , M. C. Braswell, ed. , R. E. Vogel, ed. , & K. R. Blevins (Eds.), *Transformative justice: Critical and peacemaking themes influenced by Richard Quinney* (pp. 33–41). Lanham, MD: Lexington.

Clinard, M. B., & Quinney, R. (1967). *Criminal behavior systems: A typology* . New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Martin, R., Mutchnick, R. J., & Austin, W. T. (1990). *Criminological thought: Pioneers past and present* . New York: Macmillan.

Pepinsky, H. E., ed. , & Quinney, R. (Eds.). (1991). *Criminology as peacemaking* . Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Quinney, R. Occupational structure and criminal behavior: Prescription violation by retail pharmacists . *Social Problems* 11 179–185. (1963). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1525/sp.1963.11.2.03a00060>

Quinney, R. (1970). *The problem of crime* . New York: Dodd, Mead.

Quinney, R. (1970). *The social reality of crime* . Boston: Little, Brown.

Quinney, R. (1974). *Critique of legal order: Crime control in capitalist society* . Boston: Little, Brown.

Quinney, R. (1977). *Class, state, and crime: On the theory and practice of criminal justice* . New York: Longman.

Quinney, R. (1980). *Providence: Reconstruction of social and moral order* . New York: Longman.

Quinney, R. *Leaving the country: A Midwest education in sociology in the 1950s* . *Wisconsin Sociologist* 19 54–66. (1982).

Quinney, R. *Journey to a far place: The way of autobiographical reflection* . *Humanity and Society* 8 182–198. (1984).

Quinney, R. *The theory and practice of peacemaking in the development of radical criminology* . *The Critical Criminologist* 1 5. (1989, Winter).

Quinney, R. (1991). *Journey to a far place: Autobiographical reflections* . Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Quinney, R. (1991). *The way of peace: On crime, suffering, and service* . In H. E. Pepinsky, ed. , & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Criminology as peacemaking* (pp. 3–13). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Quinney, R. *A life of crime: Criminology and public policy as peacemaking* . *Journal of Crime and Justice* 16 (2) 3–9. (1993). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0735648X.1993.9721490>

Quinney, R. (1998). *For the time being: Ethnography of everyday life* . Albany: SUNY Press.

Quinney, R. (2000). *Bearing witness to crime and social justice* . Albany: SUNY Press.

Quinney, R. (2000). Criminology as moral philosophy, criminologist as witness . In R. Quinney (Ed.), *Bearing witness to crime and social justice* (pp. 193–213). Albany: SUNY Press.

Quinney, R. (2000). Socialist humanism and the problem of crime: Thinking about Erich Fromm in the development of critical/peacemaking criminology . In K. Anderson, ed. , & R. Quinney (Eds.), *Erich Fromm and critical criminology: Beyond the punitive society* (pp. 21–30). Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Quinney, R. (2001). *Borderland: A Midwest journal* . Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Quinney, R., & Wildeman, J. (1991). *The problem of crime: A Peace and social justice perspective* (3rd ed.). Mountain View, CA: Mayfield.

Trevino, J. (1984). *Richard Quinney: A biography* . Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Cincinnati, OH.

Wozniak, J. F. (2008). The relevance of Richard Quinney's writings on peacemaking criminology: Toward personal and social transformation . In J. F. Wozniak, ed. , M. C. Braswell, ed. , R. E. Vogel, ed. , & K. R. Blevins (Eds.), *Transformative justice: Critical and peacemaking themes influenced by Richard Quinney* (pp. 167–190). Lanham, MD: Lexington.

Wozniak, J. F. (2008). Toward a theoretical model of peacemaking criminology: An essay in honor of Richard Quinney . In J. F. Wozniak, ed. , M. C. Braswell, ed. , R. E. Vogel, ed. , & K. R. Blevins (Eds.), *Transformative justice: Critical and peacemaking themes influenced by Richard Quinney* (pp. 141–166). Lanham, MD: Lexington.

Wozniak, J. F. (in press). *Becoming a peacemaking criminologist: The travels of Richard Quinney* . In F. T. Cullen, ed. , C. L. Johnson, ed. , A. J. Meyer, ed. , & F. Adler (Eds.), *The origins of American criminology (Advances in Criminological Theory: Vol. 16)*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Wozniak, J. F., ed. , Braswell, M. C., ed. , Vogel, R. E., ed. , & Blevins, K. R. (Eds.). (2008). *Transformative justice: Critical and peacemaking themes influenced by Richard Quinney* . Lanham, MD: Lexington.

Wright, R. A. Recent changes in the most-cited scholars in criminology: A comparison of textbooks and journals . *Journal of Criminal Justice* 28 117–128. (2000). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2352%2899%2900039-2>